ing qualities quite eat the good out of him. He was a member of the House of Representatives for many years, and when he first entered as a young man, gave a promise which time has not fulfilled. He drew largely on the future, but it has been a struggle to keep well on his legs, and things look as though his reputation was doomed at last to go to protest, and leaving him politically bankrupt. Of late years he has aimed at cutting a figure as an active member of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, but while he has often expounded and expanded what he has persuaded himself, and tried to persuade others, were statesmanlike views on the general questions he has brought forward, he has only met the fate that genius often meets with; he has been unobserved and neglected. We presume it is his misfortunes in this line, that have prompted him to strike out on a new path. He has left the ocean of national affairs, to try the dirty track and muddy courses of disunion. He has mounted the fiercest charger of the Southern stud, in this race, and seems bound to win or break his neck. We can hardly doubt which it will be. Befere the slow and stately commonwealth from which Mr. Clingman hails, goes over and joins the noisy crowd of disunionists, it must forget the calm counsels of a Macon, and the generous sentiments and lofty statesmanship of a Mangum.

If we had the ear of Mr. Clingman, we should counsel him to have a decent regard to his position. We should tell him that it is unbecoming and disgraceful in a United States Senator to use the language which the telegraph reports him to have used in the debate on Monday. It indicates neither statesmanship nor courage, to threaten a bloody conflict in the Capitol, because of a peaceful and constitutional election of a President of the United States. Brave men, considerate men, wise men, do not talk in that way. It disgusts the common sense and general intelligence of the entire Republie. It is the bravado of pothouse politicians and peltroons, and not the discourse of men really in

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION. A Republican of Philadelphia writes us in regard to the Convention as follows:

"I can confidently assert that the majority of the Republicans are with me, at least as far as Philadel-phia is concerned, in the opinion that the time fixed for the holding of our Convention should be changed; the 13th of June is too late. Let the other Republican journals follow the example of THE TRIBUNE, and speak out boldly upon this subject. Let them demand that the Committee reassemble, and appoint an earlier day for the holding of the Convention."

The St. Louis Democrat warmly seconds the proposal that the time should be changed. We quote from that journal:

"The selection of Chicago as the place in which to hold the Republican Convention has been acquiesced in: but the time is pronounced too late by the Republi cans and Free Democrats of St. Louis, as well as by those for whom THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE and The Chicago Press and Tribunc speak. We are authorized to make this declaration by the Executive Com-

mittee of the Opposition in St. Louis.
"There are other reasons in behalf of an earlier day. The State election takes place in Missouri on the first Monday in August, and between that date and the 13th of June the interval is altogether too short for effecting a thorough organization of the Opposition in this State. We are also convinced that the Opposition at large, being constituted of three or four diverse though not dissimilar parties, will require a good deal of drilling to secure united action and bring out its full

"We suggest that Monday, the 7th of May, be substituted for Wednesday, the 13th of June, as the day for the meeting of the Convention. Let us have a six menths' canvass this time. We are persuaded that the longer the controversy lasts, the greater the benefits that will accrue to the Opposition. Neither is it entirely beneath consideration, that the early days of May will be a pleasanter season for traveling and sitting it a crowded hall than the middle of June."

-The date proposed by The Democrat is not a day too soon. Indeed, we are convinced that April would be better for the meeting than May. But, at any rate, do not let it be put off till June.

While The Journal of Commerce, Atlas and Argus, Express and other organs of doughfacedness in this region receive Mr. Charles O'Conor's recent arguments for Slavery with inconsistent and illogical coldness, they find a different appreciation in the States where Slavery is known and loved for itself, and not as a mere means of getting into office. Thus at a recent public banquet in Richmond, Va., the Hon. John Randolph Tucker, Attorney-General of the State, in the course of an animated speech in favor of preserving the Union on the basis of the divinity and benefibence of the peculiar institution, paid to our distinguished fellow citizen the following eloquent tribute:

quent tribute:

"I thank God that there is one man at the North, and that man connected with the profession to which I have the honor to belong, who has struck the one key-note to whose music we may all step. There is one man whom I desire to cast on this occasion, and from whom I received a letter to-day, in which he said that there is one impression which must be made on the Northern mind—that the institutions of the South are not only not dangerous but meral and right; and that until the Northern people come to understand that there is a political as well as a Caristian principle, which, whether they choose to adopt or not, is to be extended to us in the maintenance of our institutions, they are the surface of the Is to be extended to us in the maintenance of our institutions, they cannot expect we will consent to perpetuate this Union. I will propose to you the health of a gentleman—a toast which I trust we shall all drink standing—the only man in all these Union meetings who has really struck the true key note of the Union—I mean Charles O'Conor, east, of New York, the grasp of whose hand I have been honored in having, whose friendship I am honored by having; Charles O'Conor, east, a true son of the of the Emerald Isle—a true Irishman—but, by the Powers above, as true an American as steps the soil of this country. I propose to you, gentlemen, the health of Charles O'Conor, a native of the Emerald Isle, a son of New York by adoption. Let us hall bim as a son of Vinginia by knoor. This sentiment was received with loud applaces."]

Whethere the doubtface, Critics of Mr. O'Conor

Whatever the doughface critics of Mr. O'Conor may say, they can never take away from him the credit of clearly seeing and frankly stating the vital question at issue. Others may dedge and squirm, and be on both sides at once; but that can never be said of the great lawyer of New-York.

THE IMPOVED AND UNIMPROVED PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF NEW-YORK .- The City of New-York, notwithstanding the immense size which it has attained, has barely covered more than half its boundary. The city comprises 141,486 lots, of which 54,725 have been built upon or improved, and 86,761 still remain vacant. In the ensuing fifty years, it is probable that all of these lots will be built on or improved, and if Brooklyn and its suburbs are in the mean time consolidated with this city, New-York will equal in area and population any city in the world. The following statement shows the number of improved, and unimproved or vacant lots in each Ward:

Wards.	improved.	Chimprovina	3,05
1	2,032	. 24	2,90
£1	1,214	1	1,31
		4	1.93
III	********* 1 500	40	1,39
	1,358	14	1.94
V	1,965	14	1.37
VI	1,261	11	
VII		420	2,90
2/7/1	2,709	31	2,73
19.14.L	2 656	405	4,00
1A.consesses	3,656	- 91	1,60
X	1,647	48.07	3,19
XL	2,534	esoro.	56.30
XII	2,062	54,339	
VIII	1,568	181	1,63
WITE	1,431	6	1,58
ALT	2,617	89	2,70
Atregerences	***********	1.045	4.72
XVL	8,709	2,040	3, 72
XVII	3,559	200	
XVIII	4,135	2,491	15.04
X1X	2,065	12,977	12,04
XX	4,275	1,721	2,99
YYI	3,441	1 647	5,08
		10,589	14.25
AAH	3,699	Attaches	1377
	-	ac mer	141,4
Tutal	54,725	80,701	

THE LATEST NEWS

MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

From Washington.
patch to The N. Y. Tribane.
WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Jan. 17, 1860.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE. This was another exciting day in the House Mr. Hutchins of Ohio, in a brief, manly, and forcible speech, introduced the plurality proposition and sustained it as the most effectual mode of perfecting an organization. He exposed the shameful manner in which the motives and acts of the Republicans had been arraigned and assailed for defending the rights and convictions of their constituencies on the subject of Slavery. At the conclusion, be called for the previous question quickly, which disconcerted the programme of the Disunionists. who stood ready to cry out their objections.

Mr. Washburn of Maine defended the proposi tion with a clear argument, and produced the proceedings of the XXXIVth Congress as a justifiable

When the Democratic side found Hutchins's promptitude had foiled their plan, they commenced fillibustering under the lead of Mr. Reagan, who moved a call of the House, which was defeated by three majority, Messrs. Adrain and Riggs voting wiih us. This done, the Clerk decided that the question before the House was on sustaining the demand for the previous question on Mr. Hutchins's resolution, but immediately receded from that position on pressure from Mr. Winslow and others.

A general discussion of points of order followed, in which Mr. Washburn insisted with much force that all resolutions and motions were out of order, and the House must meet the question to elect a Speaker now.

Mr. Hickman spoke to this point with great effect, charging that the whole proceedings on the other side were intended to prevent an organization, and hence the resistance to the plurality rule. This telling speech disturbed their composure, and Mr. McClernand, of Illinois, replied with much personal denunciation.

Mr. Pryor followed in a sharp assault, stigmatizing Mr. Hickman's charge as false.

Mr. Hickman coolly answered Mr. Pryor in a few decisive words, but took no notice of Mr. Mc-Clernand whatever.

The plurality rule is now in the best attitude before the House yet attained. The country will see in the discussion the purpose to avoid a vote and prevent the election of a Speaker. Whenever the House comes to the test, it must decide whether Mr. Hutchins's motion is in order. That may be reached by demanding a continuous session until determined. There was a strong disposition to begin to-day, even without a full understanding. Two or three days' resolute persistence might bring the

THE MAIL CONTRACTORS.

There is a large number of mail contractors here, who waited on the President with the hope of de vising some mode of relief, but without success. GEN. CASS'S RECEPTION.

Case's first reception to-night was a brilliant one. It was attended by the diplomatic corps, leading men of both parties in Congress, and distinguished strangers. His is one of the few houses in which hospitality is not regulated by partisanship. THE SENATE.

Nearly the whole sitting of the Senate was consumed in discussing Mr. Bowman and his candidacy for Printer. Mr. Brown (Miss.) produced documents establishing the fact that the United States Attorney-General was witness to an arrangement, by which Mr. Bowman violated the law. The developmen's proved that \$11,000 of the pub lie money had been appropriated to sustain party organs here and in Philadelphia. Messrs. Bigle and Davis defended that arrangement, and Mr. Clay proposed an investigation; which, after a riddling by Mr. Fessenden, he withdrew, and Mr. Bowman was elected, receiving 27 out of 48 votes. This result was foreshadowed, when the President brought his whole power on each individual member of the party.

A POOR COMPLIMENT. Judge Breese (Ill.) treated the offer of the Marshalship as no compliment to his position.

To the Associated Press. Washington, Tuesday, Jan. 17, 1860. The Navy Department has been informed that the steam sloop of war Wyoming has reached Rio de Janeiro in 36 days from Philadelphia, and that the Lancaster, from Valparaiso to Panama, made for five con-secutive days, with steam alone, from nine to ten and a half knots an how, which speed the flag officer con-siders unexampled. The sloop-of-war John Adams, after slight repairs, had proceeded from Rio de Janeiro to the East Indies. A letter has been received from Judge Breese, de-

clining the appointment of Marshal for the Northern

District of Illinois.

The Presidents of the various Virginia railroad companies have issued a call inviting all the Southern railroad companies to meet them in consultation at Richmond, on the 28th of February, to consider the means by which they can best secure, either by direct

means by which they can best secure, either by direct importation or Southern manufacture, the equipments and supplies for the use of Southern railroads.

The annual meeting of the American Colonization Society was held at the Smithsonian Institute to-night. The attendance was large. Addresses were delivered by the Hon. Mr. Taylor of Tennessee, Dr. Styles of Georgia, and the Rev. Dr. Penny of New-York. The presents of the year amount to pearly \$150,000 and the receipts of the year amount to nearly \$161,000, and the expenditures to \$80,000. The Society have sent about \$600 immigrants to Africa during the same period.

XXXVITH CONGRESS. FIRST SESSION.

SENATE WASHINGTON, Jan. 17, 1860. A communication was received from the Secretary

A communication was received from the Section of War.

Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.) introduced a bill supplementary to the act of 1851, relative to the liabilities of ship-owners. Referred.

Mr. CAMERON (Rep., Pa.) introduced a bill for the relief of the widow of Gen. Persifer F. Smith.

Mr. MASON (Dem., Va.) introduced a memorial of the Alexandria and Washington Railroad Company, for leave to bring their road across the Long Bridge and connect with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

Mr. SLIDELL, (Dem., La.) from the Select Committee, reported back the bill to prohibit the circulation in the District of Columbia of bills under twenty delles, with the recommendation that it pass.

dollars, with the recommendation that it pass.

Mr. BROWN (Dem., Miss.) corrected a statement of

Mr. BROWN (Dem., Miss.) corrected a statement of his remarks on Jan. 3, which represented him as say-ing that the four millions of Southern slaves occupied a position higher socially, morally, and physically than any other laborers on the face of the globe. What he said was that their position was superior to that of the same race in any quarter of the globe. The hour having arrived for the election of a Printer to the South

to the Senate.

Mr. BROWN said, as he did not intend to vote for Mr. BROWN said, as he did not intend to vote for the nominee (Mr. Bowman), he world give his reasons. The first was personal to himself; the entire Constitution had, in insulting and discourteous terms, discussed the speech delivered by him before the Mississippi Legislature last Fall, without permitting its readers to see what had been said. He did not wish this to control the votes of others. In the second place, the letter of Mr. Sneed, a prominent Opposition gentleman of Mississippi, to parties in Memphis, was published in The Constitution, while his speech was excluded. Mississippi, to parties in Memphis, was published in The Constitution, while his speech was excluded. The letter of Mr. Sneed was most offensive to the Democratic party of his State, and therefore, on party grounds, he was not bound to support Mr. Bowman. The third objection was that he had heard and believed that the associate editor of The Constitution was an anatomic lead for single and we he undertakes to inunnaturalized foreigner, and yet he undertakes to in-struct him in his duty. He did not think him a proper person to edit the organ of the National Democracy,

and to be set on by such a man was more than his Southern blood could bear. The fourth objection was that Mr. Bowman, in advance of getting the printing, had bargained it away. He pronounced this disrept table. He knew Mr. Bowman denied it, but not in such a shape as to make it convincing. Such a proposal was in violation of the law which required the public triate to work his sal was in violation of the law which required the public p vinter to work himself, and he should withhold his vote on this ground. He had a great objection to being sold out in ladvance by G. W. Bowman. The fifth objection was the gravest of all. He charged that while Mr. Boaman was Superintendent of the Public Printing he, in ross violation of law, became interested in the Public Printing. In April last Mr. Bowman, then being Superintendent of the Public Printing, entered into a contract with Mr. Wendell, by which the former took The Union establishment, the latter paying \$20,000 a year to him as long as he (Wendell should be public printer. He (Bowman) received at the time \$3,000 on the contract, which had direct reference to the public printing. But the act of Mr. Bowman was either gross corruption or gross stapidity. He (Brown) did not know whether it was necessary to have an organ, but if it was we should have a decent one. He would never you money out of the treasury to sustain this ricketty Constitution. nave a decent one. He would never vote money out of the treasury to sustain this ricketty Constitution. This is not the only money paid out for papers. He had heard that The Philadelphia Pennsylvanion had received \$15,000 and The Argus \$6,000. If Mr. Wendell, who did the printing, contributed to these worthless, vagaboud papers why might not the architect of the capital the stone cutters &c. he called on but he (Brown) would wash his skirts of these darry transactions. He knew that it would be said that the office was unprofitable, and therefore that Mr. Wendell paid Mr. Bowman to take it off his bands. But could he not have got rid of it cheaper? The truth was Mr. Wendell had been compelled out of his labor to sustain this thing, an organ which was not one. He (Brown) spurned and despised the whole concern.

Mr. HALE (Rep., N. H.,) asked Mr. Brown if any Member of the Government knew of the transaction?

Member of the Government knew of the transaction !
Mr. BROWN said a letter on the subject was addressed to the Attorney-General, and of course he Mr. HALE—Did not one a peg higher than the At-

Mr. HALE.—Did not one a peg nighter than the Attorney-General know?

Mr. BROWN—I can't say.

Mr. BIGLER (Dem., Pa.) entered his protest against the inference that the President or Cabinet instigated or advised transactions by which money could be irreproperly taken from the Treasury. The press teemed with this scandal, and it was time that it was answered. He denied that the President or the Heads of Department. ments were responsible for the money paid for printing. The law separated the matter entirely from ing. The law separated the matter entirely from them. If exorbitant prices had been paid Congress was responsible, as the prices were all fixed by law. Where then was the justification for these broad imputations on the President,

Mr. BROWN said the Senator drew largely on his imagination. He (Brown) had said nothing about the President.

Mr. BIGLER had no desire to do the Senator in mr. Bittler had no desire to able to Schaol pistice. He had alluded more particularly to the general clamor on this subject. He then continued in defense of the President and the Heads of Departments. After which he referred to Mr. Bowman, saying he had known him for twenty years and that he always bore an excellent character for integrity. He had refused extra pay from the Pennsylvania Legislature of the the Maxicon war and expressed to President fused extra pay from the Pennsylvania Legislander after the Mexican war, and expressed to President Pierce on a certain occasion an attempt made to bribe him while Superintendent of Printing. He (Bowman) was vigilant, and anxious to protect the treasury against peculation. The Committee on Printing had the fullest confidence in his integrity. He had resisted the fullest confidence in his integrity. He had resisted the practice of double composition while he was in office. He (Bigler) then explained Mr. Bowman's contract with Mr. Wendell, stating that he resigned the Superintendency when he made the contract, but held the office a short time longer in order to superintend, by request of the Secretary of the Interior, some contract, for engraving. He (Bigler) also had a letter by request of the Secretary of the Interior, some contracts for engraving. He (Bigler) also had a letter read from the Attorney-General (Black) advising Mr. Bowman to make the contract with Mr. Wendell, which he regarded as a purely business transaction. Mr. Bigler asserted that the law had been observed in every particular by the President and Heads of Departments. The question of the bargain of Bowman was a private one, and one in which the Senate had no business to interfere.

Mr. BROWN had read the account of Gen. Bowman highest state the bargain.

man himself as to the bargain.

Mr. HALE wished to know if particular newspapers

were to share in the plunder this year, and whethe they would be the same old ones or a new set. Gen. Bowman's letter was read. Mr. BROWN thought that if Secretary Thompson Mr. BROWN thought that if Secretary Thompson knew what this contract of Gen. Bowman was, then he must have advised Bowman to violate the law, but he did not think the Secretary did know of it. He cared not who advised Bowman. He charged that Bowman had violated the law by being Superintendent of Printing while he had an interest in the public printing; but if the President and Secretaries advised by the contract of the contract with brinting; but if the President and decrearies advised him to continue in office, knowing the contract with Wendell, they advised him to violate the law. If the Secretary of the Interior advised Bowman, knowing the facts, he denounced his advice, notwithstanding his long friendship.

Mr. BIGLER claimed that Gen. Bowman had not

violated the law at all.

Mr. FITCH (Dem., Ind.) wished to absolve the Atrney-General from any collusion in the matter.— Then he gave his advice he supposed that Gen. Bow-

in had resigned.

Mr. BROWN had no doubt of it. But this did no

led away by his feelings. One would suppose that some flagrant act had been committed. The law is, that the Superintendent of Public Printing shall not be that the Superintendent of Public Printing shall not be interested in the public printing. A newspaper had been transferred to Bowman, to whom it was of no consequence where Wendell got the money. The money could not have been made while Bowman retained his place as Superintendent of Public Printing. The purpose of the law was to prevent corruption on the part of the Superintendent. In this case it is shown that Bowman remained in office a few weeks shown that Bowman remained in office a few weeks shown that Bowman remained in onice a lew weeks only, and did not in that time settle any accounts con-nected with the public printing. This \$20,000 was not given to Bowman exclusively. In this contract nothing was said of the printing for the Senate, but it was ex-ecutive work of that character which can be sent out of the District. Was this voting money out of the

Mr. BROWN explained that he complained because the man who did the work got \$20,000 less than the law allowed him, and this sum went to the man who

Mr. DAVIS explained that it was not a matter of legislation whether this man got too much or too lit-tle. He thought the question of the Associate Editor had nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. BROWN said he objected to a man not natural-ized being the editor of the organ of the Democratic

party.

A long colloquy ensued between Mr. Davis and Mr.

year.

Mr. HALE said he hoped to get some light on the subject, but had about given up. He therefore moved to adjourn, but the motion was objected to, and it was

Mr. CLAY (Dem., Ala.) said that if the election were pressed at this time he should not vote for Bow-man. We thought the matter should be investigated, and offered a resolution that a Committee be appointed

to investigate the matter.

Mr. HALE thought the resolution of inquiry should Mr. HALE thought the resolution of inquiry should have a wider scope. There were other charges against Bowman. He wanted to know whether it was a condition of the contract that \$20,000 should be paid to one paper and \$15,000 to another and \$6,000 to another with the knowledge of the Attorney-General. Though it is said that the rest of the Administration did not know of it then, yet he thought it was implied that they did know of it immediately after. He looked upon the latter charge as most serious.

Mr. JOHNSON (Dem., Ark.) was opposed to going into investigation. He was ready to elect a Printer, and then if the charges were made and proved, he was ready to expel him.

Mr. KING (Rep., N. Y.) was astonished to see any disposition to cover up and cloak investigation.

isposition to cover up and cloak investigation.
Mr. JOHNSON (Ark.) did not wish to do that.
Wr. FESSENDEN (Rep., Me.) thought it tool investigate all the charges.
Mr. FESSENDEN (Rep., Me.) thought it tool investigate in the charges.

make Republicans listen to a family quarrel. He thought they had better settle it among themselves. After some further discussion, Mr. Craig's resolution

was withdrawn.

A motion to adjourn was made and lost, and the Senate proceeded to ballot for a Printer, with the following result:

The Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17, 1860.

There being a slim attendance, there was a call of

Mr. PENNINGTON withdrew his resolution proposing the adoption of the plurality. He did so, he said, to avoid confusion.

aid, to avoid confusion.

Mr. HUTCHINS (Rep., Ohio) said that up to this time, in obedience to a policy which was approved by the judgment of a majority of his political friends, and in accordance with his own judgment, he had refrained from participation in the discussion which has taken place preliminary to an organization. He fully con-curred with his political friends that such a discussion,

anterior to an organization, is out of place and out of order, and he must be allowed to say, that, in his judgment, it had been conducted in exceeding bad taste, to use no harsher term. The Republican party, and the people of the Free States had been rudely and shame-lessly assalled; their motives, their principies, and their acts grossly misreprecented; their patriotism impeached, and some of their number denounced as wor hy of the gallows, for frankly expressing, in the exercise of their undoubted constitutional rights, their sentiments upon the subject of Siavery. But he did not propose to reply to any of the arguments which had been addressed to them from the Democratic side, because to do so would be to condemn his own sentiments and action in the premises up to this time. Resolutions had been introduced, and were now pending, declaring that certain individuals, entertaining certain opinions and indorsing certain sentiments, are unfit for the Speakership. In his judgment there were a great many who are politically unfit to be Speaker of this House. In his judgment, no man who sustained the Pro-Slavery, contract, jobbing policy of the Administration, was fit politically to be Speaker, or who believed that it is right to reopen the African slavetrude, or who opposed the admission of Kansas under her recently acopted Constitution; but he would regard it entirely out sf order for him to introduce a recolution to that effect. He denied the right of a majority or minority to prescribe a rule by which his vote for Speaker shall be controlled and regulated. They were to determine by their votes who is fit and who is unfit to be Speaker of this House, and the man that could receive a majority of all the votes in any way that the House sees fit to adopt is, in the opinion of that majority, fit to be Speaker of this House. He intended, however, to confine himself to the point of organization. That was in order and proper to be discussed. He spok for nobody, and none of his political friends were responsible for anyt sible for anything that he might utter. He was unlike his colleague (Mr. Corwin) in at least one respect he was not a leader of the Republican party. He imne was not a leaser of the Republican party. He may peached to man's motives, and would concede that every man has discharged his duty conscientiously, both in discussing and voting. He believed they had faithfully endeavored to reach an election by a majority, but after six weeks of effort they had not succeeded, and he believed that the majority of members of all and he believed that the majority of memoers of air parties desired an organization; that the interests of the Government, and especially the condition of its creditors, demanded an immediate organization; the country was sick of their rhetorical and polemical ex-ercises in this Hall. In the present state of parties he ercises in this Hall. In the present state of parties he believed it was impossible to ever get a majority vote for Speaker, directly. They had tried it in vain, but it did seem to him that there was one way by which the House can be organized. Had it come to this, that a majority of the House cannot control its action—that, if a majority really desire organization, there was no way by which that organization can be effected? If that were so, they were at the mercy of a minority, however small that minority might be. It had been said that the plurality rule was uncenstitutional. The language of the Constitution

the mercy of a minority, however small that minority might be. It had been said that the plurality rule was uncenstitutional. The language of the Constitution was very brief on that point: "The House of Repre-"sentatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers." The manner of choice was, as a matter of course, left entirely to the discretion of the House. It might be done by voting viva voce, by a secret ballot, or by the appointment of a Committee. Even admitting, for argument's sake, that a majority was required, if that majority declared that the person receiving the highest number of votes on a given ballot shall be Speaker, that was the action of the majority electing a Speaker in that way. They had precedents for this course from both the political parties of the country, and everybody was familiar with them.

Mr. WASHBURNE (Rep., Me.) desired leave to call attention to the opinion of some of the ablest Democratic Members of toe XXXIVth Congress on this very point. He quoted from the remarks of Mr. Clit gman of North Carolina, to the effect that a resolution subsequent to the election of a Speaker by the plurality, was altogether unrecessary.

Mr. BARKSDALE (Dem., Miss.) referred to the election of Speaker Cobb, and asked if that gentleman was regarded as Speaker before the passage of a resolution by a majority vote declaring him elected, and whether the same thing was not done when Mr. Banks was elected?

Mr. WASHBURNE replied by referring to the decla-

Banks was elected ?

Mr. WASHBURNE replied by referring to the decla. ration of several leading Democrats that no such resolution was necessary, and it was only to prevent any coult from remaining in the minds of gentlemen that

the subsequent resolution was passed.

Mr. BARKSDALE said the precedent must be taken

together.
Mr. WASHBURNE would see what it amounted to Mr. WASHBURNE would see what it amounted altogether. Mr. Clingman, Mr. Jones of Tennessee, and others, held that the adoption of the plurality rule by a majority was sufficient, and the resolution offered by Mr. Clingman declared that by reason of the adoption of the plurality resolution, and the votes taken under it, Mr. Banks had been duly chosen Speaker.

under it, Mr. Banks had been duly chosen Speaker.

Mr. MILLSON (Dem., Va.) said the gentleman holds that if the majority authorize the minority to elect, then the election by the minority is a valid election by the majority. Now certainly the minority is not the House. It must be something else than the House or somebody else than the House can authorize sombody else than the House to elect a Speaker, may the House by a majority authorize the President of the United States to appoint a Speaker, and would such appointment be a valid election by a majority of the House under the Constitution?

Mr. WASHBURNE said he had abundant and conclusive authorities to which he might refer the gentle-

clusive authorities to which he might refer the gentle-man. The Speaker was the gentleman selected to steak for the House as its mouth-piece, and he was aware of no constitutional provision requiring even that he should be a member. If the House might by aware of no constitutional provision requiring even that he was violating the law of the country. He must have known it if he could read his commissions. He must have violated the law knowingly and deliberately.

Mr. DAVIS (Dem., Miss.) thought his colleague was a Mr. CLYFIS (Love, Rep.) thought less than a ma-

authorize the President to appoint him.

Mr. CURTIS (Iowa, Rep.) thought less than a majority could not elect, but a majority might appoint persons to select the Speaker, and such selection under the authority of the House would constitute an election by the majority. For instance, they might designate the tallest and the shortest man, and that would be Constitutional [laughter], but he would not go out of the House. To refer the matter to the President would be sealed further than he was ready to go.

Mr. MILES (S. C., Dem.) inquired if the gentleman from Maire believed the majority have a right to authorize the President to pass such needful laws and appropriations as may be necessary for the country, and then adjourn and go home?

Mr. WASHBURNE rather thought not; but it was no part of the legislation of the House to appoint an individual to speak for them as their organ. Their first duty was to choose a Speaker and Clerk, and then take the cath of office, and that was by law a standing order of the House. To proceed to the election of Speaker was in order at all time, and nothing else was Speaker was in order at all time, and nothing else was in order. Any member had a right to insist upon the execution of this standing order of the House, and it was the duty of the Clerk, acting as presiding officer, to carry out that order of the House, without debate or delay. All they could do without violation of law and their constitutional obligations, was to vote steadily for Speaker. They had been proceeding seven weeks in a factious and disorganizing manner, when, if the parliamentary law were observed, they might organize immediately. The standing order to proceed to an election was of course a privileged question, overimmediately. The standing order to proceed to an election was of course a privileged question, over-riding all others, except questions of order growing out of that, and motions to adjourn. It was a question which ought to be put and acted upon without debate or delay. The Republicans stood before the country as having been ready from the first to adopt any possible mode of organizing. They were satisfied with their position as a party, for they knew they were being strengthened as they never were before they were being strengthened as they never were before by this long discussion of their opponents. But their con-stituents were getting tired of these Disunion speeches. and they were anxious to perform their Constitutional duties, and prevent the Government from being brought to a dead lock. They were so national, sound, and conservative, and so impregnable in their position, that they could afford to wait until the organization before entering upon any general discussion.

before entering upon any general discussion.

Mr. HUTCHINS proceeded. He was not used to this way of putting three or four other men's speeches into his own, and hoped he would be no further interrupted. The practical question before the House and the country was, whether they should adopt the plurality rule or go without an organization. It did appear to him, from the plain reading of the Constitution, that the mode of election by the plurality rule was Constitutional beyond a peradventure or a doubt, and believing so, of course he was ready to vote for it. He did not ask those who did not think so to vote for it: but the question was not now an open one. it; but the question was not now an open one having been decided by the former action of this Hous upon two memorable occasions, and by different par-ies seeking to control the destinies of this Union. A majority of the House believed that this was a Consti-utional mode of organizing and if all the second majority of the House beneved that this was a Consultational mode of organizing, and if others did not think so they could vote against it, and their opinions would be respected. He was sorry to be compelled to announce that, in his judgment, there was a respectable, intelligent, determined minority upon this floor who do not desire an incity upon this floor who do not desire an was a respectable, intelligent, determined innority upon this floor who do not desire an
organization. In the expressed language of one gentleman (Mr. Pugh of Alabama), if they could have
their way they would perpetuate discord here. They
were but a handful of men, and he admired their
talent and boldness. They had proclaimed their purpose to resort to this as a means of disorganizing the
Government, They were a class of men who believe
that the Bible was given to man, that the Declaration
of Independence was adopted, and that the Constituhold that there is such an incurable sentiment the other way in the Free States, and in some of the Slave States, that the only remedy is a peaceable dis-

solution of this Government. That, he believed, was
the true reason why this House was not organized. What was involved in this discussion? In
the Treasury were about six millions of dollars fromestly due to needy creditors of the Government, for
services faithfully performed under the plighted faith
of the nation, but which cannot be paid to them until
a bill appropriatin; it to that purpose is passed. The
Government was paralyzed, and the country was suffering from this non-organization. Throughout the
length and breadth of the land the country demanded
some measure of relief from the disorganizing tendenfering from this non-organization. Throughout the length and breadth of the land the country demanded some measure of relief from the disorganizing tendencies which prevail here. It was due to all parties to make a fair and honest trial to elect by majority; but that trial having failed, they must take other measures. It had been said that if the plurality rule should be proposed questions of order would be raised and the House kept disorganized in all time to come. But he believed, although he was not experienced in legislative matters, that the majority have the power to organize the House in three or four days if they have the will. He wanted to know if the majority had not as much physical endurance as the minority. He told them that what was wanted was a little more of that "by the Eternal" spirit which distinguished and characterized the old hero of the Hermitage, and then this House would be organized. They had only to say they would do it. Had they not given the other side a chance to discuss for the past six weeks? He thought they had succeeded pretty well in hanging themselves in that time, and all that remained for them to do now as Christian not given the other side a chance to discuss for the past six weeks? He thought they had succeeded pretty well in hanging themselves in that time, and all that remained for them to do now, as Christian people, was to cut them down and give them a decent burial. Sanitary considerations required that, in order to avert the deleterious and dangerons effects arising from the odors of putrefaction. [Laughter.] For his part he was willing to stay here until Saturday night, if necessary to effect an organization, by the will of the majority, and if any body, in good health, could not do that, he advised him to go home to his constituents, and let them send somebody who will. He had no fears of dissolution of the Union. The body politic was not much diseased on that subject, though it might be in certain localities. Even in the Southern States, when that question should assume a practical shape the people would speak out with determination and effect. A set of political doctors had been making applications to the Northern part of the body politic, but he suggested that the better way would be to apply the plaster where the sore exists. [Laughter.] He thought a plaster on the head was not likely to cure a wounded heel. It was time to organize. The creditors of Government had a right to demand it. Some had said that night sessions might result in a row; but who was afraid of a row? He did not expect to get through Congress on flowery beds of ease. They came here peaceably and quietly did not expect to get through Congress on flowery beds of ease. They came here peaceably and quietly beds of ease. They came here peaceably and quietly to maintain the constitutional rights of the people—even at the sacrifice of their lives, if need be. A little nerve and spirit here, and the House would be organized. He now moved that the House proceed to vote for Speaker rira voce, and that the person receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared Speaker of this House, and on that he called the previous evention.

Mr. WINSLOW (Dem., N. C.) and others objected. Mr. DAVIDSON (Dem., La.) moved a call of the

Mr. DAVIDSON (Dean, Lan, Lan, Land House,
Decided in the negative by three majority.
The CLERK said the question recurred on seconding the demand for the previous question.
Mr. WINSLOW raised a point of order.
Mr. HOUSTON (Dem., Ala.) contended that the resolution was not before the House, not having been read by the Clerk.
The CLERK remarked, as several gentlemen had

objected to the resolution, he would put the resolution in this form: Is the motion of Mr. Houston in order?

Mesars. REAGAN (Dem., Texas) and BARKS-DALE (Dem., Miss.) severally insisted that all other pending questions must first be disposed of before acting on this. on this.
Mr. WASHBURN (Me.) briefly argued that the

House had no right to entertain any proposition except the election of a Speaker.

Mr. CURTIS asked whether Mr. Reagan would vote lay all pending propositions on the table so as to Mr. REAGAN replied he had no authority, for

friends agree that pending questions must first be dis-posed of, and asked Mr. Washburn of Maine whether he did not, prior to Mr. Banks's election, vote for cer-tain resolutions. Mr. HOUSTON wanted to refresh his recollection.
Mr. WASHBURN (Rep., Wis.) had no doubt that
the only business in order was the election of a Speaker.
Mr. BURNETT (Ky.) wished to be informed how
Mr. Washburn would dispose of Mr. Montgomery's
resolution, declaring Mr. Cowwin temporary Speaker,
and the other propositions pending?

and the other propositions pending?

Mr. WASHBURN replied: A motion to proceed to the election of a Speaker takes precedence of all

hers.
Mr. BURNETT referred to the records to show that prior to Mr. Banks's election, Mr. Washburn voted on a series of resolutions offered by Mr. Dunn, declaring that persons holding certain political sentiments, was not fit to be Speaker. He did this to show Mr. Wash-

burn's inconsistency.

Mr. WASHBURN replied, it was not important
whether he was consistent or not, but it was important
he should be right.

Mr. HOUSTON said Mr. Clark's resolution which was pending declared that a man who indorsed Help-er's book, which counsels treason and murder, is unif-for Speaker. That was not the ease with Mr. Dunn's solutions.

Mr. WASHBURN replied that by voting on the

air. WASHBURN replied that by voting on the
latter he did not commit himself to any point of order.
Mr. DAVIDSON wanted to know whether Mr.
Washburn had ever read in the spelling-book the
story of the farmer and lawyer and the ox and the Mr. SICKLES (Dem., N. Y.) said no

order was made when Mr. Clark of Missouri offerents resolution, and therefore they had a right to assum it was properly before the House; and the only way it could be got rid of was by a motion to lay on the table could be got rid of was by a motion to lay on the table or by a direct vote. He argued that a practicable rule must be adopted in order to enforce the election of a Speaker by a majority. He then explained his proposition, which provides that the House will proceed to the election of a Speaker, viva voce, and if, upon the first call of the roll, no one shall have a majority, a quorum being present, then from those having the highest numbers, the candidates not exceeding three, the House will proceed to make a chaine by a second highest numbers, the candidates not exceeding three, the House will proceed to make a choice by a second vote, and, if neither has a majority, then from the two highest on the list the House will make a choice of a Speaker. And, also, that if upon the third vote the said two parties shall receive an equal number, the House will continue to vote for one or other of the same two persons, until one of them shall receive a majority; and that, pending the election and until a choice be made, there shall be no debate. The most that is claimed for this proposition is, that it is accordthat is claimed for this proposition is, that it is accord-ing to the Constitutional mode of electing a President by the House, in the event of a failure by the people to do so, and the mode by which the Senate chooses a Vice-President in the same contingency.

Vice-President in the same contingency.

Mr. SICKLES said the problem of organization will not be solved until certain Southern Oppositionists and Anti-Lecomptonites be brought to choose between the Republican and the Democratic nominees. He submitted that his proposition was analogous to the plan prescribed by the Constitution in the event of the failure of the people to elect a President and Vice-President. It was expedient and salutary, and would lead to a certain result. He would take the earliest convenient eccasion to offer it to the House. ecasion to offer it to the House.

Mr. CLARK (A. L., N. Y.) said the proposition wa

Mr. CLARK (A. L., N. Y.) said the proposition was impracticable. There was no mode to enforce it.

Mr. REAGAN approved of the spririt of Mr.
Sickles's resolution, but, as Mr. Clark said, there was no practicable way of its enforcement. It addressed itself to the favorable consideration of members, and if others would consent to abide by it, he would do likewise. He suggested that the resolution of Mr. Hutchins be withdrawn, and that the House do now proceed to yote for a Speaker.

now proceed to vote for a Speaker.

Mr. WASHBURN (Rep., Me.) asked whether Mr. Reagan and his friends would consent, after such a rote, that the resolution be renewed.

Mr. REAGAN had no authority to speak for them. Mr. BRANCH (Dem., N. C.) moved that the House

Mr. BRANCH (Dem., N. C.) moved that the House proceed to vote for Speaker.

Mr. ELLIOTF (Rep., Mass.) objected.

Mr. BRANCH said that the House should make an effort to elect in the ordinary way. It was apparent to the House that Mr. Hutchins's resolution could not be voted on for a great length of time.

Mr. TOMPKINS (Rep. Ohio) inquired whether Mr. Branch thought that a vote would result in election.

Mr. BRANCH said he belived not, but there was nothing like trying.

othing like trying.

Mr. WASHBURN (Me.) asked why the Demo cratic side of the House would not consent that Mr. Hutchins's resolution should be renewed if temporarily

rithdrawn for a vote.

Mr. BRANCH replied that a great many gentlemen Mr. BRANCH replied that a great many gentlemen on the Democratic side entertain the opinion that the plurality rule is a violation of the Constitution, and they never will give their consent to it.

Mr. REAGAN renewed the motion that the House proceed to an election—viva voce—for Speaker.

This was objected to by several gentlemen on the Depublican side.

This was objected to by several gentiemen on the Republican side.

Mr. HICKMAN (A. L., Pa.) said they had now come to a deadlock—a point they might as well have reached four weeks ago. The Southern minority say they will not submit to a majority.

Mr. BARKSDALE—You mistake their position.

Mr. HICKMAN (A. L. Dem., Pa.) said, it is now plainly and distinctly announced that a majority on this floor have resolved, in effect, that no Speaker shall be elected, for the only possible way to elect is by the plurality rule, which has become a precedent for such difficulties as this, in Congress. The position now plainly assumed is, that though a majority of this

House may desire to adopt the plurality rule, they all not be permitted to do so.

th respect.

M. HICKMAN declined to yield for that purpose.

M. HICKMAN declined to yield for that purpose.

The de claration had been made here by more than one
Southern gentle, man, that they are determined to
rest by all parlis mentary means the introduction of
the resolution, and it had been added to-day, by all

other means.
Mr. WINSLOW (De n., N. C.) said he regarded the

other means.

Mr. WINSLOW (De. n., N. C.) said he regarded the plurality rule as utterly unconstitutional, and would oppose he adoption by all a gittimate means, but would oppose he adoption by all a gittimate means, but would make no actions opposition a taking that question at the proper time, which would only be after the House had fairly me the resolution of ered by Mr. Clark of Missouri, and voted upon it.

Mr. HICKM an had not mistake in the gentleman's position, and had only failed to state his reasons for it. He understood his to say that he we ald resist a vote on the Plurality Rule by dilatory mo, tons, such as calls of the House, motions to adjourn, etc. It all came to the tame thing; that the Southern side of the House, and with them the Northern Democracy, respecting honest countinencies, had come up here resolved that under no circumstances will they permit this plurality rule to be voted upon. The declaration was, that all nearly in the suppose of that rule, yet the voice of that overraining majority of this body may be in favor of the adoption of that rule, yet the voice of that overraining majority rule unconstitutional, was he to permit them to instruct him? Was that Democracy? He claimed the right to interpret tee Constitution as he understood it.

Mr. MILLSON, of Virginia (Dem.), asked if the

Mr. MILLSON, of Virginia (D'em.), asked if the

it.

Mr. MILLSON, of Virginia (Dem.), asked if the gentleman referred to his position.

Mr. HICKMAN said that he was referring now to some remarks made by the gentleman's colleague (Mr. Garnett), a few days ago. When a Democratic minority chose to disregard the will of the majority, and say they should not, under any circumstances, manifest that will, it was time to know where they stood. This, and all that had transpired for the last five weeks, means only one thing, and that was that this House shall not corganized, but that the reign of terror had already commenced: that disunion was budding and lost commenced: that disunion was budding and blosseming, and soon to bear fruit. Gentlementalked of propositions being illegitimaty, and offered out of time and season, but no proposition had been made from the first which was not, in the opinion of some gentlemen, out of time and season. Propositions had been made to dispose of all questions on the Clerk's table, but they were refused to be entertained on the Democratic side. Nobody would deny that his motion to correct the journal, pending the past three or four weeks, was a proper one, and yet no vote could be had upon it. It was a part of the programme that no lyote shall be taken that will even approximate to an organization. He had proposed a straight vote on Mr. Clark's resolution, and that the consideration of the plurality rule should follow that, but the proposition had been repudiated, and he was constrained to the opinion that there was a solemn determination to prevent an organization on the part of Southern Democrats, and by Northern Democrats also, termination to prevent an organization on the part of Southern Democrate, and by Northern Democrate also, who would never be able to answer to their con-

who would never be able to answer to their constituents.

Mr. BARR (Dem., N. Y., interrupting) said Northern Democrats would speak for themselves when the proper time came. The gentleman could only speak for those Democrats who had run away for the sake of pottage, and didn't get it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKMAN said if they came to the Republica a side they would find stronger graef than on that side. He always thought a gentleman was driven to han a shifts when he leaves regular argument for persona t assaults. The Northern Democracy were so far controlled by Southern men as to lend their cooperation, and assistance to prevent an organization of the House.

Mr. BARR denied that any Southern man or Northern man had controlled any vote of his.

ern man had controlled any vote of his.

Mr. HICKMAN s id they were prevented from voting on the plurality rule.

Mr. BARR—Have I given any vote to stop it.

Mr. HICKMAN said, a few days ago all the Northern Democracy voted with the South to sustain the previous question, in order that the introduction of any amendment in the shape of a provise, or, in other words, of the plurality rule, might be presented. For that reason, he said, the Northern Democrats were controlled in their action here, and stood alongside of the most ultra in opposing the organization. Was there any necessity for taking another ballot? Were they to engage from day to day in such a useless and ridiculous farce? He would not favor another ballot for Speaker until he should become satisfied that a change had taken place in the minds of Members, or until something analogous to the plurality rule should be adopted. These ballots were not expected to effect anything except to quiet the Democratic party in the North, which was becoming restless, and a ballot would be generously proposed every day, in order that it might go forth in all the newspapers that the Democracy are doing all they can to organize. He would assist no further in this work of deception. He stated in the presence of the Republican party that a determination must be manifested sooner or later to resist this impotent humbug. He hoped they would stand upon the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio, until a disposition should be manifested on the other side to take

resolution of the gentleman from Ohio, until a disco-sition should be manifested on the other side to take up the questions as they presented themselves legiti-mately on the Journal, and the plurality rule mately on the Journal, and the parameters would be reached in a proper way. He did not care for coming here to listen to speeches, for he knew they were having effect of tearing the scales from the eyes of those who act with the Democracy at the North, and that are, by what doctrines and political heresies they are hereafter to be bound. He could listen to speeches, because that was profitable, but he would refuse to cast fruitless votes, and engage in the ludicrous scenes

cast fruitless votes, and engage in the ludicrous scence which had already sufficiently amused the country.

Mr. McCLERNAND (Dem., III.) said Mr. Hick man's insolence was unbearable. By what authority did the gentleman from Peansylvania speak as he did? He was not one of the Democrats, although he pretended to be. This pretension was unfounded. He was not a Democrat, but a recreant, a traitor to the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We disown and repudiate him. The gentleman from Pennsylvania imputed what was false when he said Northern men are controlled by Southern men. This charge could emanate only from a man who is controlled, and who is the slave and instrument of others. Mr. Hickman has boxed all the points of the political compass. He first denounced Gen. Jackson.

Mr. HICKMAN asked Mr. McClernand to give way

Mr. HICKMAN asked Mr. McClernand to give war Mr. McCLERNAND (sternly) not a word. A VOICE-"Go to the Republican side, where you

Mr. McCLERNAND further spoke of Mr. Hick-Mr. McCLEKNAND further spoke of Mr. Hick-man's alleged political inconsistencies, and said the latter was a follower of Seward, and a supple instru-ment in the hands of the Republican party. He had betrayed all parties and principles, and now undertook to exercise a censorship over the Democrats. He stated his objections to Mr. Sherman, but said Mr. Sherman was infinitely preferable to Mr. Hickman. [Applanes.]

Sherman was munitely preferable to Mr. Hickman.

[Applause.]

The Clerk requested gentlemen to keep order and not encourage applause in the galleries.

Mr. PRYOR (Dem., Va.) began to reply to Mr. Hickman, remarking that what the latter had stated was what he knew to be false. [Sensation.]

Mr. MILLSON (Dem., Va.) called his colleague to order, stating that his colleague could be severe without heigh unpublishmentary.

order, stating that his colleague could be severe without being upparliamentary.

Mr. PRYOR said that he knew only the plain Anglo-Saxon tongue, and repeated that Mr. Hickman's statement was false.

Mr. MILLSON—I repeat the point.

Mr. KEITT—I shall discuss that.

Mr. PRYOR defended the Democrats from the charge of being factious, saying that the Republicans were not, as they claimed, a majority. We, he added, are in a majority, and have shown it by thirty odd ballots.

cries from the Republican side—Try it; we resist

Mr. HICKMAN—The gentleman raises a question of eracity with me.

Mr. PRYOR—I say distinctly that your statement is

Mr. HICKMAN—And I distinctly so understood you. He said to Mr. Pryor, and to all others who thought as the latter did, that he would not depart from his sense of propriety nor suffer himself to be diverted from his self-respect nor forfeit the good opinion of his people—if he possessed it—by joining in an issue with him in the court he (Mr. Pryor) might prefer. He did not recognize that as a tribunal of the country. He had made the declaration, and desired that it should stand. If there he doubt as to its truthfulness, let the truth be determined by a tribunal of more general extent than that the gentleman prefers. He meant the country.

Mr. PRYOR—Does the gentleman signify the tribenal?

Mr. HICKMAN—I understand quite well what !cind. Mr. HICKMAN—And I distinctly so understood you

mal?
Mr. HICKMAN—I understand quite well what I and
of trial it is intended to bring me into here.
Mr. PRYOR—I can assure the gentleman and the
House that I meant no invitation or menace to a perconal combat. His vivid imagination created the peril.
[Laughter.] I merely invoked the record.
Mr. HICKMAN—Then the gentleman and have
been more guarded. When Southern gentlemen make
use of such language, it can be understood only in one
way. I say now, he can't try any question with me
in his court. I prefer to select my o'wn tribunal. I

See Bighth Page.